



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/204,888	12/03/1998	CHARLES A. ELDERING	8887.3002	9427
27832	7590	04/02/2004	EXAMINER	
EXPANSE NETWORKS, INC. 6206 KELLERS CHURCH ROAD PIPERSVILLE, PA 18947			BUI, KIEU OANH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	20
DATE MAILED: 04/02/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/204,888

Applicant(s)

ELDERING ET AL.

Examiner

KIEU-OANH T BUI

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 78-109 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 78-109 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 18.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Terminal Disclaimer

1. The terminal disclaimers filed on 4/11/2000 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of patent 6,457,010 and/or to any patent granted on pending application 09/205,119 has been received.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments (filed 10/30/2003) with respect to claims 78-101 and new claims 102-109 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351 (a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 78-89, 102, 104, and 106-107 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Alexander et al. (US Patent 6,160,570/ or Alexander).

Regarding claim 78, Alexander discloses a method for generating a subscriber profile for a subscriber of television services, the method comprising:

- a) monitoring subscriber interactions with a television (col. 28, line 12 - col. 29, line 11);
- b) retrieving content characteristics (EPG) associated with content included in the subscriber television viewing interactions (col. 28, line 12 - col. 30, line 37);

Art Unit: 2611

- c) processing the subscriber television viewing interactions and the content characteristics to generate subscriber viewing habits (e.g. viewer watches "sports" etc. col. 29, lines 55-67);
- d) retrieving heuristic rules associated with at least some subset of the subscriber interactions, i.e., profile program "learns" or performs "sophisticated analysis" (col. 29, line 55 - col. 30, line 44), wherein the heuristic rules associate subscriber television viewing habits with non-television viewing characteristics about the subscriber (an individual viewing habits compared with the profile of others , col. 30, lines 38-44, wherein the profile of others include demographic characteristics or non-television viewing characteristics , e.g., viewer's sense of humor, chronological age, activity age, whether the user has kid or not, and/or having pets or not, see col. 30/lines 17-37); and
- e) applying the heuristic rules to the subscriber interactions to generate the subscriber profile (col. 30, lines 1-44).

Claim 79 is met by programming and advertisements disclosed throughout the entire reference including but not limited to col. 18, lines 1-54.

Claim 80 is met by EPG content characteristics disclosed throughout the entire reference including but not limited to columns 7-8.

Claim 81 is met by at least some of subset of program category, program sub category or the EPG themes or rating control (sports, news etc.) (col. 7, lines 45-55; and col. 17/lines 13-36 for parental guidance control addressed).

Claims 82-84 are met by EPG content and data-mining, at least to EPG data or HTML pages (inherently understood to use the Internet) disclosed throughout the entire reference including but not limited to col. 31, lines 48-53, and col. 8, lines 18-64 for EPG data downloading and Internet pages.

Claim 85 is met by the monitoring of viewer interactions including selecting programs and interacting with the EPG as disclosed in columns 28-30.

Claims 86-89 are met by non-television viewing characteristics include at least some subset of age and/or family size such as the viewer's sense of humor, chronological age, activity age, whether the user has kid or not, and/or having pets or not, see col. 30/lines 17-37); and/or married status (family size) as disclosed on col. 28, lines 11-51 and col. 30, lines 30-44.

As for claims 102, 104, 106-107, these claims with same limitations for a method for generating a demographic profile a subscriber based on subscriber interactions with a television are rejected for the reasons given in the scope of claims 78-89 as discussed in details above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2611

6. Claims 90-101, 103, 105 and 108-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander et al (US Patent 6,177,931 B1) in view of Sitnik (US Patent 6,160,570).

Regarding claim 90, Alexander suggests that at least the subset of program genre (col. 28, lines 1-21, col. 29, lines 37-67) change to family size (married status, col. 30, lines 29-32), program genre to age (col. 30, lines 29-31), yet Alexander does not further mention "program genre to income level, and program genre to gender"; however, in the same environment of providing program services to users based on the user's profile, Sitnik teaches to include collecting viewer profiles further including the user's sex or gender, the yearly income level, personal preferences, and personal habits (col. 1/line 58 to col. 2/line 4 for an example of appropriate images and programs to children under the age of thirteen; Fig. 3, and col. 7/line 40-57 & col. 8/line 53 to col. 9/line 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Alexander's technique with Sitnik's teaching technique of collecting demographics information of users including sex or gender, and the income level in order to target programs and services including advertisements to appropriate viewers at a particular geographical location.

Considering claims 91-92 and 98, Alexander discloses a method for generating a subscriber profile for a subscriber of television services, the method comprising: a) monitoring subscriber interactions with a television (col. 28, line 12 - col. 29, line 11) b) retrieving heuristic rules associated with at least some subset of the subscriber interactions, e.g., the profile program "learns" or performs "sophisticated analysis" (col. 29, line 55 - col. 30, line 15), wherein the heuristic rules related to age and family size, i.e., wherein the profile of others include

Art Unit: 2611

demographic characteristics or non-television viewing characteristics , e.g., viewer's sense of humor, chronological age, activity age, whether the user has kid or not, and/or having pets or not, see col. 30/lines 17-37); and c) applying the heuristic rules to the subscriber interactions to generate the subscriber profile (col. 30, lines 17-37).

Alexander does not further mention "wherein the heuristic rules predict demographic characteristics about the subscriber including at least some subset of gender and income level"; however, in the same environment of providing program services to users based on the user's profile, Sitnik teaches to include collecting viewer profiles further including the user's sex or gender, the yearly income level, personal preferences, and personal habits (col. 1/line 58 to col. 2/line 4 for an example of appropriate images and programs to children under the age of thirteen; Fig. 3, and col. 7/line 40-57 & col. 8/line 53 to col. 9/line 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Alexander's technique with Sitnik's teaching technique of collecting demographics information of users including sex or gender, and the income level in order to target programs and services including advertisements to appropriate viewers at a particular geographical location.

Claims 93 and 94 are met by the monitoring, retrieving and applying of the EPG (content characteristics) as disclosed throughout the entire reference including but not limited to col. 28, line 11 - col. 30, line 37.

Claim 95-97 are met by the combination of Alexander and Sitnik as the association of subscriber interactions (Alexander, col. 28, line 12 - col. 29, line 1 and col. 30, lines 7-9) with specific demographic characteristics or non-interaction traits (age, married, viewer with children, Alexander, col. 30, lines 17-37). Alternatively, Claims 95-97 are met by the association of

Art Unit: 2611

subscriber interactions (an individual viewer profile) with viewer profile of others (Alexander, col. 30, lines 38-44), wherein the viewer profile of others include demographic characteristics or non-interaction traits, i.e., viewer's sense of humor, chronological age, activity age, whether the user has kid or not, and/or having pets or not, see col. 30/lines 17-37). Sitnik teaches the gender and the income level concerned (as discussed earlier in claims 90-92).

Claims 99-101 are met by Alexander as Alexander discloses the retrieving content characteristics associated with content included in the subscriber interactions, wherein heuristic rules associate specific subscriber interactions with specific demographic characteristics such as age and married status (family size) at a particular location (col. 28, lines 11-52 and col. 30, lines 30-44).

As for claims 103, 105, 108-109, these claims with same limitations for a method for generating a demographic profile a subscriber based on subscriber interactions with a television, i.e., related to gender and income level, are rejected for the reasons given in the scope of claims 90-94 as discussed in details above.

Conclusion

7. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2611

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krista Kieu-Oanh Bui whose telephone number is (703) 305-0095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:30 PM, with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile, can be reached on (703) 305-4380.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Krista Bui
Art Unit 2611
March 30, 2004



KRISTA BUI
PATENT EXAMINER